UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/731,673	12/08/2003	Srikanth Karimisetty	021756-002000US	4263

51206   7590   08/19/2008
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
8TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER
PATEL, NIRAV B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2135	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/19/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *10 June 2008 (RCE)*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-6,8-15,17-23,25 and 26* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-6,8-15,17-23,25 and 26* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date *6/10/08*.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's submission for RCE filed on June 10, 2008 has been entered. Claims 1-6, 8-15, 17-23, 25 and 26 are pending. Claim 26 is newly added by the applicant.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-6, 8, 10-15, 17-23 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al (US Patent No. 7,136,873) in view of Schneier et al (US Patent No. 5,978475) in view of Chang et al (US Patent No. 6,584,459) and in view of Numao et al (US Patent N0. 6,647,388).

As per claim 1, Smith teaches:

storing a plurality of electronic records in a common repository of electronic records in the database [Fig. 1, 34 component 16], creating a security protocol that protects the electronic records against unauthorized access [Fig. 34, component 1604]; creating a query designed to identify electronic records in the database that meet criteria designated in the query [Fig. 34, 27, col. 41 lines 1-11]; prior to executing the query, modifying the query in accordance with the security protocol (i.e. access policy) to

create a modified query [Fig. 34, col. 42 lines 1-5]; and running the modified query against the data [Fig. 34, col. 40 lines 57-61].

Smith teaches storing plurality of electronic records as shown in Fig. 34. Smith does not expressively mention that provides an audit trail that cannot be altered or disabled by users of the system.

Schneier teaches storing a plurality of electronic records in a common repository of electronic records in the database that provides an audit trail that cannot be altered or disabled by users associated with the database [Fig. 3, col. 6 lines 41-64, col. 12 lines 47-50].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Schneier with Smith, since one would have been motivated to generate a secure audit log [Schneier, col. 3 line 8].

Chang teaches each electronic record comprises unstructured data stored in a character large-object (CLOB) format in a column of a table of the database [Fig. 1, 3, col. 11 lines 61-67, col. 12 lines 1-19].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Chang with Smith and Schneier, since one would have been motivated to provide efficient database management system [Chang, col. 3 lines 31-33].

Numao teaches: generating one or more security rules in response to input identifying one or more elements in the unstructured data (e.g. parameter which identifies subject,

object...etc.) as elements of the one or more security rules [Fig. 5, 6, 1, 2, col. 10 lines 66-67, col. 11 lines 1-42], wherein the security policy (protocol) protects the unauthorized access based on the one or more security rules [Fig. 1, 2].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Numao with Smith, Schneier and Chang, since one would have been motivated to provide a conditional response that is dependent on the establishment of a specific state [Numao, col. 2 lines 1-2, 15-21].

As per claim 2, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Numao teaches allowing a user to identify the one or more element in the unstructured data as indexed elements [Fig. 5, col. 10 lines 66-67, col. 11 lines 1-16]; and allowing a user to generate the one or more security rules based on the indexed elements [Fig. 5, col. 11 lines 20-24, Fig. 6].

As per claim 3 and 4, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Smith teaches access to electronic records in the common repository is automatically granted/denied unless the security protocol restricts/grants such access [Fig. 34, col. 42 lines 59-62].

Numao teaches:

access to electronic records in the common repository is automatically granted/denied unless the security protocol restricts/grants such access and wherein the security protocol comprises a plurality of security rules that restricts access to the electronic records within the database [Figs. 1, 2, 4, 5].

As per claim 5, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Smith teaches:

the plurality of electronic records are generated from multiple data sources [Fig. 5].

As per claim 6, the rejection of claim 5 is incorporated and Smith teaches a predefined mapping of the fields to multiple data sources [Fig. 5, col. 4 lines 53-55].

Chang teaches the fields of the electronic records are filled with XML data based on a predefined mapping to multiple data sources [col. 2 lines 18-28, Fig. 4].

As per claim 8, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Chang teaches the unstructured data comprises well-formed XML documents stored within the column of the table stored in the database [col. 13 lines 29-49].

As per claim 10, it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 1. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 1 above.

As per claim 11, the rejection of claim 10 is incorporated and it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 2. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 2 above.

As per claim 12 and 13, the rejection of claim 10 is incorporated and they encompass limitations that are similar to limitations of claims 3 and 4. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claims 3 and 4 above.

As per claim 14, the rejection of claim 10 is incorporated and it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 5. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 5 above.

As per claim 15, the rejection of claim 14 is incorporated and it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 6. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 6 above.

As per claim 17, the rejection of claim 16 is incorporated and it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 8. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 8 above.

As per claim 18, it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 1. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 1 above.

As per claim 19, the rejection of claim 18 is incorporated and it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 2. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 2 above.

As per claim 20 and 21, the rejection of claim 19 is incorporated and they encompass limitations that are similar to limitations of claims 3 and 4. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claims 3 and 4 above.

As per claim 22, the rejection of claim 18 is incorporated and it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 5. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 5 above.

As per claim 23, the rejection of claim 18 is incorporated and it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 6. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 6 above.

As per claim 25, the rejection of claim 18 is incorporated and it encompasses limitations that are similar to limitations of claim 8. Thus, it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 8 above.

3. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al (US Patent No. 7,136,873) in view of Schneier et al (US Patent No. 5,978475) in view of Chang et al (US Patent No. 6,584,459) and in view of Numao et al (US Patent N0. 6,647,388) and in view of Kahn (US Patent No. 7,185,192).

As per claim 9, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Kahn teaches:

allowing a user to enable and disable the security protocol [col. 4 lines 43-67, col. 5 lines 1-37, 44-49].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Kahn with Smith, Schneier, Chang and Numao, since one would have been motivated to provide robust access control mechanisms using a flexible authorization system [Kahn, col. 4 lines 20-22].

4.   Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al (US Patent No. 7,136,873) and in view of Numao et al (US Patent No. 6,647,388).

As per claim 26, Smith teaches:

generating a security protocol based on the security rule [Fig. 34, component 1604]; receiving a query designed to identify documents stored in the database that meet criteria designated in the query [Fig. 34, 27, col. 41 lines 1-11]; prior to executing the query, modifying the query in accordance with the security protocol (i.e. access policy) to create a modified query [Fig. 34, col. 42 lines 1-5]; and generating information indicative of executing the modified query against the document [Fig. 34, col. 40 lines 57-61].

Numao teaches: generating one or more security rules in response to input identifying an XML elements in at least one XML the document (e.g. parameter which identifies

subject, object...etc.) as security elements of a security rule [Fig. 5, 6, 1, 2, 3, col. 10 lines 66-67, col. 11 lines 1-42], generating the security policy (protocol) based on the security rules [Fig. 1, 2].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Numao with Smith, since one would have been motivated to provide a conditional response that is dependent on the establishment of a specific state [Numao, col. 2 lines 1-2, 15-21].

Response to Amendment

5. Applicant has added new claim 26 which is rejected based on the cited prior art Smith et al and Numao et al. See rejection above.

Regarding to applicant argument that "Numao does not include in response to input identifying one or more elements in unstructured data as elements of the one or more security rules", Examiner disagrees, since Numao teaches receiving/inputting an access request and parameter as shown in Fig. 1 or 2. The access request that employs as parameters, Subject, which is data used to identifying the subject by which the access request was submitted, Object, which is data used to identify an access target, and Operation, which is data used to identify an operation to be performed for the access target [e.g. query (use(Nihon Taroh/IBM/Japan), 'http://admin.trl.com//form//**expense.xml**', read(html)))]. A rule that matches all the

parameters (Subject, Object and Operation) in the access request is searched for in the

access control policy database. The policy rule format employed as parameters are

Subject, Object (i.e. 'http://admin.trl.com//form//**expense.xml**'), Operation and

Condition. Together these parameters constitute the rule **[Fig. 6, col. 11 lines 1-42]**.

The name of the file (expense.xml) is an element in the document (document/data

contains many attributes/elements, e.g. the name of file, type of file...etc.), which is

used as an element of the security rule as discussed above. Therefore, it meets the

claim limitation. From the examiner point of view the cited reference clearly teaches the

claim limitation as above. The argued limitation "element in unstructured data as

elements of the one or more security riles" must be clearly defined in the claimed

language, if Applicant believes it differs from the cited one. Applicant is reminded that

additional modification to clarify the claimed language is necessary for further

consideration and distinction from the prior art.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

Kudoh et al (US Patent No. 7409390) – Access control system and methods

Stakutis et al (US 7188127) -- Method, System and Program for processing a file

request

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to NIRAV PATEL whose telephone number is (571)272-5936. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 am - 4:30 pm (M-F).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached on 571-272-3859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

NBP
8/13/08

/KimYen Vu/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2135